



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,378	07/14/2006	Toshihiro Tai	3400.P1434US	2951
23474	7590	06/01/2011	EXAMINER	
FLYNN THIEL BOUTELL & TANIS, P.C. 2026 RAMBLING ROAD KALAMAZOO, MI 49008-1631		KRUER, KEVIN R		
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1787		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		06/01/2011		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action

Applicant's arguments filed May 26, 2011 have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Furthermore, the proposed amendment has not been entered because it would require further search and/or consideration. The limitations of the proposed amendment have not previously been considered. In addition, the amendment has not been entered because it is not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing and/or simplifying the issues on appeal.

With respect to Sano, Applicant argues the reference contains a generic disclosure and does not disclose any specific compositions which fall within the scope of the present claims. Said argument is noted but is not persuasive because the examiner never relied upon Sano to anticipate the claimed invention. Rather, the examiner took the position that the claimed invention was obvious based upon Sano in view of Morimoto. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicant argues the claims are patentable over the applied art based upon secondary considerations-specifically, unexpectedly improved adhesive strength properties. Said argument is noted but are not persuasive for the reasons noted by the examiner in the 5/16/2011 Final Rejection.

For the reasons noted above, the rejections are maintained.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEVIN R. KRUER whose telephone number is (571)272-1510. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Callie Shosho can be reached on 571-272-1123. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/KEVIN R KRUER/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1787